



RE: 12-20 PH Managers mtg

TARNOW Karen E to: TARNOW Karen E, Dawn Sanders,
cstivers, Scheffler, Linda, Laura Jones,
Andy Koulermos, Kristine Koch

01/02/2007 01:13 PM

1 attachment



12-20 PH managers mtg.doc

Oops, I forgot to attach the notes.

-----Original Message-----

From: TARNOW Karen E
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2006 7:55 AM
To: Dawn Sanders; Carl Stivers
(cstivers@anchorenv.com); 'Scheffler,
Linda'; 'Laura Jones'; Andy Koulermos; Kristine Koch
(koch.kristine@epa.gov)
Subject: 12-20 PH Managers mtg

The notes from the meeting are attached. In short,
they agreed to
remove Fred Devine from the list and replace it with
Sulzer (this
recommendation came from Keith), accepted our
recommendations with a
slight twist to the phthalate proposal, and gave the
following direction
to the Tech Team related to the recommendation to
move a couple of
sampling locations to the "end" of the pipe and the
concerns Dawn raise.
[Dawn's email is attached below.]

"The Managers asked that the Tech Team discuss Dawn
Sanders' 12/21 email
that more fully describes this issue to ensure that
they are still
comfortable moving ahead with the proposed changes.
In the meantime, it
will be assumed that the decisions reflected in these
notes [i.e.,
accept the recommended changes to the sampling site
locations] will not
change and that work can proceed as necessary to
implement the plan."

Dawn - would you take the lead on initiating that
conversation, via conf
call or email?

Karen

-----Original Message-----

From: Sanders, Dawn [
mailto:DAWNS@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2006 1:11 PM
To: TARNOW Karen E; koch.kristine@epa.gov; Scheffler,
Linda; Andy
Koulermos; Laura Jones; Carl Stivers
Subject: RE: 12-20 Memo from Tech Team to Managers

I've had a chance to talk further with some of our stormwater folks and think I can better articulate my concern about the proposed change in approach to sampling at end of outfalls in mixed use basins.

The major objective for sampling is to get data that will allow us to estimate Harbor-wide loading to the river. Since sampling at every outfall (with enough samples to have some confidence to estimate loading) is cost and time prohibitive, we agreed on a land-use-based approach.

The sampling was geared towards collecting data to develop land use loading rates for each type of land use category. The number of sample locations for each category was influenced by the variability in contaminant type and concentrations expected and, to a lesser degree, the areal coverage of the land use in the Study area. Therefore, areas with higher expected variability would be sampled at a higher frequency so that the average of all the loading rate within a category more closely approximated a true average. At a minimum, we will have 9 heavy industrial sites sampled 3 times each, which gives us a sample size of 27. This assumes that unique sites aren't used for developing a land use average, which if they are, would make this data set (and the resulting average) more robust.

One Monday, the tech team discussed sampling at the end of outfalls with a mix of land use categories, with the rationale that collecting data directly is better than modeling these basins. This essentially means we are developing a basin-specific loading rate. But these outfalls would only be sampled 3 times, which, given the expected variability in

stormwater quality, would provide a highly inaccurate basin specific loading rate. Larger basins typically have higher variability because, depending on the duration and intensity of the storm, contaminants are mobilized differentially in different portions of the basins. Therefore, a higher sampling frequency is needed to estimate an average than is required from a smaller basin.

Trying to estimate total loading with data sets of very different data quality would greatly increase the overall error and is technically invalid. To develop a basin-specific loading rate for sites with mixed land use categories and lots of heavy industrial uses would require a data set roughly comparable to the industrial land use data set: therefore, we should sample these outfalls about 27 times. Obviously, that is not feasible.

The above discussion is relevant to 2 of the 3 City sampling locations that were changed. M-1 is primarily light industrial, although one might expect to see slightly higher concentrations because it has a manufacturing facility (Freightliner). But there are 3 other light industrial land use stations and so it may not significantly change the average. If we keep this location, I would propose to move it to a land use station to strengthen our light industrial loading rate average.

-----Original Message-----

From: TARNOW Karen E [<mailto:TARNOW.Karen@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 10:37 AM
To: Valerie Oster
Cc: koch.kristine@epa.gov; Sanders, Dawn; Scheffler, Linda; Andy Koulermos; Carl Stivers; Laura Jones; TARNOW Karen E
Subject: RE: 12-20 Memo from Tech Team to Managers

Here it is.

-----Original Message-----

From: Valerie Oster [<mailto:voster@anchorenv.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 10:16 AM
To: TARNOW Karen E
Subject: RE: 12-20 Memo from Tech Team to Managers

Thanks Karen -

Is there a final list of recommended sites? Could you send this to me?

Valerie Thompson Oster
Anchor Environmental, L.L.C
6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 110
Portland, OR 97224
Phone: 503-670-1108 x19
Fax: 503-670-1128

From: TARNOW Karen E [
mailto:TARNOW.Karen@deq.state.or.us]
Sent: Wed 12/20/2006 10:07 AM
To: Valerie Oster
Subject: 12-20 Memo from Tech Team to Managers

Val - Please distribute this to the managers. Thanks

In addition, here's an update on the FSP. Carl Stivers is working on the first draft of the FSP and plans to have the it ready by early January for the Tech Team to review.

<<12-20 Memo to PH Managers.doc>>

Karen Tarnow
Oregon DEQ
Portland Harbor Storm Water Coordinator
503-229-5988